Channel Tunnel Rail Link London and Continental Railways Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture

The later prehistoric pottery from Beechbrook Wood, Hothfield, Kent

by Grace Perpetua Jones

CTRL Specialist Report Series 2006

©London and Continental Railways

All rights including translation, reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of London and Continental Railways

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		INTRODUCTION	4
2		CHRONOLOGY	6
3		RECOVERY	6
4		FABRICS	7
5		BRONZE AGE FABRICS	9
	5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.4	 Flint-tempered Grog-tempered Grog and flint-tempered Sandy wares Rock-gritted 	9 .10 .10 .10 .10
6		IRON AGE FABRICS	.10
	6.1 6.2 6.4 6.4 6.6 6.7	 Flint-tempered	.10 .10 .11 .12 .13 .13 .13
7		FORMS	.17
8	7.1 7.2 7.2 7.4 7.4 7.6	 Bronze Age forms	.17 .17 .18 .20 .22 .23 .23
9		SURFACE TREATMENT	.27
1	0	EVIDENCE OF USE	.32
1	1	VESSEL SIZE	.33
1	2	DISCUSSION	.34
1	3	CATALOGUE OF ILLUSTRATED SHERDS	.40
1	4	BIBLIOGRAPHY	.44

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Quantification and phasing of later prehistoric pottery by feature type	4
Table 2: Quantification of Bronze Age pottery by feature type	7
Table 3: Quantification of Iron Age pottery by feature type	7
Table 4: Quantification of later prehistoric fabric types	7
Table 5: Quantification (by percentage) of Bronze Age and Iron Age fabric groups	14
Table 6: Correlation of form to fabric	25
Table 7: Occurrence of surface treatments on Bronze Age vessels, by number of records	27
Table 8: Occurrence of surface treatments on Iron Age vessels, by number of records	28
Table 9: Occurrence of surface treatments in each form class	30
Table 10: Evidence of use on Bronze Age vessels	32
Table 11: Evidence of use on Iron Age vessels	32
Table 12: Vessel capacities	. 34
Table 13: Vessels deposited in context 2212, ditch 2150	38

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:Frequency of fabric groups by % of sherd count	16
Figure 2: Histogram of rim diameters, presented in 2cm intervals.	33
Figure 3: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 1-16	
Figure 4: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 17-20	
Figure 5: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 21-30	
Figure 6: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 31-40	
Figure 7: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 41-63	
Figure 8: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 64-90	
Figure 9: Beechbrook Wood - Later prehistoric pottery, 91-99	

1 INTRODUCTION

A total of 3366 sherds of later prehistoric pottery, weighing 42,561 g, was recovered from an excavation and targeted watching brief at Beechbrook Wood (ARC BWD 98 and ARC BBW 00). The assemblage ranged in date from the middle Bronze Age to the middle Iron Age, and derived from 84 contexts, representing 72 features (Table 1). The overall mean sherd weight of the assemblage was 12.8 g, and 11 complete vessel profiles could be reconstructed (Table 11). The condition of the Bronze Age material was moderate, with some degradation of the surfaces. The early Iron Age pottery was in poor condition and displayed a high degree of surface abrasion. The middle Iron Age sherds displayed above-average preservation, with a large proportion (42% by count and 60% by weight) deriving from a single context (2213, enclosure ditch 2150). The pottery was recorded using the methodology designed for the route-wide scheme in accordance with the recommendations set out by the Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group (PCRG 1997).

Feature	No	Weight (g)	Ceramic phase
Sub-group and intervention nos.:			
Ditch 1020 [960]	1	12	1-3
Ditch 1027 [857]	2	15	5
Ditch 1682 [1712]	1	1	0
Ditch 1902 [1690]	1	2	1-3
Ditch 1907 [1587]	4	24	5
Ditch 1926 [1918]	3	7	1
Ditch 1935 [1482]	2	23	0
Ditch 1955 [1723]	1	3	3
Ditch 1957 [1079]	2	18	5
Ditch 1964 [1115]	1	12	4-5
Ditch 1969 [1277]	1	6	3
Ditch 1972 [1196]	1	30	3
Ditch 2025 [2092]	9	27	5
Ditch 2149 [2166]	4	16	5
Ditch 2150 [various]	1439	21471	5
Ditch 2151 [various]	36	154	5
Ditch 2303 [2258]	2	4	5
Ditch 2432 [2324, 2372]	25	225	5
Ditch 2434 [2249, 2404, 2417, 2424]	14	66	5
Ditch 2435 [2253, 2264, 2397]	62	267	5
Machining in area of ditch 2150 (contexts 2147 and 2427)	319	4180	5
Posthole 2321, located within 2150	1	2	5
Pit 2366, located within 2150	15	226	5
Posthole 2400, located at terminal of ditch 2151	5	17	5
Finds recovered from the junction of ditches 2433 and 2435 (context 2430)	54	127	5
TTH 2385 at terminus of 2151	7	16	0
Ditch 7000 [2379, 2392]	2	12	5
Ditch 7001 [various]	565	3623	5

Table 1: Quantification and phasing of later prehistoric pottery by feature type

Feature	No	Weight (g)	Ceramic phase
Features not assigned to sub-groups:			
Pit 175	25	417	1
Pit 204	83	2197	1
Ditch 207	1	30	1
Land drain 209	4	40	3
Pit 231 [activity area 1952]	2	57	1
Pit 237 [activity area 1952]	35	378	1
Pit 245 [activity area 1952]	63	1533	1-2
Pit 404	2	147	3
Posthole 410	1	1	3
Vessel in cut 418	76	2053	1
Pit / posthole 419	3	90	1
Ditch 422	7	26	1-3
Ditch 432	1	1	0
Pit 444	29	192	3
Pit 450	6	37	2-3
Pit 456	1	29	1
Surface finds, Area A (context 459)	4	19	5
Ditch 475	3	14	0
Pit 536	7	224	3
Pit 551	28	91	1
Tree-throw hole 649	3	236	1-3
Pit 651	21	296	1
Ditch 859	1	2	0
Tree-throw hole 1039	2	13	0
Pit 1049	1	138	1-2
Ditch 1064	1	10	0
Ditch 1135	1	1	1
Pit 1192	2	15	3
Ditch 1202	3	10	3
Ditch 1209	2	66	3
Pit 1220	27	1081	3
Ditch 1255	1	14	2-3
Pit 1288	11	313	3
Pit 1331	49	400	3
Ditch 1343	2	46	1
Ditch 1435	2	15	1
Posthole 1532	4	68	5
Pit 1623	1	8	3
Pit 1709	1	2	3
Pit 1910	1	24	3
Ditch 2019	243	1259	4
Pit 2023	5	36	5
Posthole 2197	2	5	5
Posthole 2219	2	4	5
Ditch 2283	1	1	0
Posthole 2375	1	22	5
Land drain 2411	2	11	0
Topsoil	7	88	0
Subsoil	5	165	1
Unstratified	2	50	0

Feature	No	Weight (g)	Ceramic phase
Total	3366	42561	

Ceramic phases: 0: unphased; 1: middle Bronze Age; 2: middle to late Bronze Age, transitional phase; 3: late Bronze Age; 4: early Iron Age; 5: middle Iron Age

2 CHRONOLOGY

The assemblage is divisible into three Bronze Age and two Iron Age ceramic phases. The earliest is ceramic phase (hereafter cp) 1, characterised by Deverel-Rimbury pottery of the middle Bronze Age. This ceramic tradition has been placed in Period 5 of Needham's chronology of the British Bronze Age (Needham 1996), dated to 1500-1150 cal BC. Barrett has shown that the Deverel-Rimbury ceramics are 'succeeded by an essentially plain ware tradition' (Barrett 1980, 314), reflected here in ceramic phase 3 and in Needham's Period 6, dated to 1150-950 cal BC. Needham notes that this new ceramic repertoire 'resulted from developments in Deverel-Rimbury forms, albeit under some external stimulus' (Needham 1996, 134). At Beechbrook Wood and other sites along the CTRL route, the transition between the Deverel-Rimbury and plain ware ceramic traditions is reflected in subtle changes of fabric and form, and is here recorded as cp 2.

Early Iron Age pottery is present on the site (cp 4), but only one feature (ditch 2019) produced material dated to this period. The later prehistoric assemblage was dominated by middle Iron Age vessels (cp 5). Pottery of this phase accounted for 75% of the stratified sherd count, with the bulk of material recovered from enclosure ditch 2150, primarily from within context 2213.

3 RECOVERY

The vast majority of the pottery was stratified in features and has been quantified by feature type, on a broad period basis, in Tables 2 and 3. In addition, 29 sherds (386 g), were either unstratified, recovered from layers (including the topsoil and subsoil) or from unphased features. The Bronze Age pottery was predominantly recovered from pit features. A single possible waterhole (245) and an in-situ vessel (403) also produced reasonable quantities of material. Only a small amount of pottery was recovered from ditches, a posthole and a tree-throw hole. Although a mortuary connection was initially suspected for a number of the Bronze Age pits, there is nothing in the human bone assemblage to support this interpretation. The depositional pattern for the Iron Age was quite different, with 99% of the material recorded from ditches. Enclosure ditch 2150 produced 51% of the count, and 67% by weight, of the Iron Age pottery, a further 20% by count and 11% by weight was recovered from the recut of this ditch (sub-group 7001).

Feature Type	Count	% of count	Weight (g)	% of weight
Ditch	27	5	268	3
Land drain (post-med)	4	<1	40	<1
Pit	332	65	6046	59
Posthole	4	<1	91	<1
Tree-throw hole	3	<1	236	2
Vessel within cut	76	15	2053	20
Possible waterhole	63	12	1533	15
Total for phase	509	100	10267	100

Table 2: Quantification of Bronze Age pottery by feature type

Table 3: Quantification of Iron Age pottery by feature type

Feature type	Count	% of count	Weight (g)	% of weight
Ditch	2799	99	31547	99
Pit	20	<1	262	<1
Posthole	9	<1	99	<1
Total for phase	2828	100	31908	100

4 FABRICS

Fifty later prehistoric fabrics were identified, these have been divided into seven fabric groups on the basis of the dominant inclusions. The fabrics are quantified in Table 4, and are presented below by broad period and fabric group. The fabric descriptions were made with the aid of a x20 binocular microscope. A further miscellaneous group includes those sherds too small or abraded for identification. During analysis these sherds were recorded using the code '99', prefixed by a letter to indicate the dominant inclusion in the sherd.

Fabric	Count	% of count	Weight (g)	% of weight	Ceramic phase
F1	25	0.7	187	0.4	1
F2	167	5.0	3159	7.4	1
F3	42	1.2	1330	3.1	1
F4	36	1.1	392	0.9	1
F5	1	0.0	16	0.0	1
F6	2	0.1	10	0.0	2
F7	6	0.2	152	0.4	1
F8	65	1.9	1766	4.1	3
F9	20	0.6	277	0.7	3
F10	24	0.7	165	0.4	3
F11	2	0.1	17	0.0	3
F12	1	0.0	14	0.0	1
F13	9	0.3	265	0.6	1
F14	96	2.9	1817	4.3	5
F15	1	0.0	84	0.2	5
F16	17	0.5	371	0.9	5
F17	10	0.3	35	0.1	5

 Table 4: Quantification of later prehistoric fabric types

Fabric	Count	% of count	Weight (g)	% of weight	Ceramic phase						
F99	27	0.8	57	0.1	Later prehistoric						
FV99	2	0.1	4	0.0	Later prehistoric						
G1	103	3.1	1434	3.4	5						
G2	52	1.5	455	1.1	5						
G3	159	4.7	3610	8.5	5						
G4	1	0.0	150	0.4	5						
G5	16	0.5	225	0.5	3						
G6	53	1.6	270	0.6	5+						
G8	1	0.0	9	0.0	5						
G99	28	0.8	171	0.4	Later prehistoric						
GF1	12	0.4	174	0.4	2						
GF2	15	0.4	336	0.8	3						
GF3	6	0.2	26	0.1	3						
GI99	2	0.1	16	0.0	Later prehistoric						
GV99	1	0.0	5	0.0	Later prehistoric						
I1	98	2.9	2298	5.4	5						
I2	105	3.1	2111	5.0	5						
13	49	1.5	1012	2.4	5						
I4	102	3.0	1130	2.7	5						
15	55	1.6	734	1.7	5						
199	6	0.2	16	0.0	Later prehistoric						
IQ99	3	0.1	20	0.0	Later prehistoric						
Q1	11	0.3	34	0.1	1						
Q2	24	0.7	94	0.2	4						
Q3	15	0.4	86	0.2	4						
Q4	43	1.3	515	1.2	5						
Q5	983	29.2	5468	12.8	5						
Q6	33	1.0	1022	2.4	5						
Q7	38	1.1	435	1.0	5						
Q8	338	10.0	4461	10.5	5						
Q10	44	1.3	1453	3.4	5						
Q12	35	1.0	805	1.9	5						
Q13	8	0.2	226	0.5	5						
Q14	11	0.3	78	0.2	5						
Q15	20	0.6	146	0.3	5						
Q16	6	0.2	23	0.1	5						
Q17	2	0.1	41	0.1	5						
Q99	119	3.5	243	0.6	Later prehistoric						
QV1	158	4.7	1033	2.4	4						
R1	1	0.0	12	0.0	4-5						
UQ1	10	0.3	128	0.3	5						
Z1	47	1.4	1938	4.6	1						
	3366	100.0	42561	100.0							

5 BRONZE AGE FABRICS

5.1 Flint-tempered

F1: A soft but harsh fabric containing common to very common (25-30%) angular, calcined flint, \leq 7 mm, well sorted. The clay matrix appears slightly laminated in the fresh fracture.

F2: A soft but rough fabric containing common (25%) calcined, angular flint, \leq 7 mm, moderately sorted. The fresh fracture is hackly.

F3: A soft but rough fabric containing common (20%) angular, calcined flint, \leq 3 mm, well sorted; and rare (1%) sub-rounded, red iron oxides, <1 mm. The fresh fracture is hackly.

F4: A soft but harsh fabric containing very common to abundant (30-40%) calcined, angular flint, \leq 4 mm, well sorted. The fabric also contains rare (1%) rounded, red iron oxides, and very occasional large, sub-rounded iron inclusions, \leq 2 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F5: A soft and smooth fabric containing moderate (10-15%) calcined, angular flint, $\leq 1 \text{ mm}$, moderately sorted. There is a scatter (*c* 7%) of fine black iron grains, with an occasional sub-angular coarse grained ironstone fragment. Rare (1%) sub-angular quartz, colourless and also rose-coloured, medium to coarse-sized, is also present. The fresh fracture is relatively fine.

F6: A soft and slightly rough fabric containing sparse (5-7%) calcined, angular flint, \leq 3 mm, moderately sorted. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F7: A soft but harsh fabric containing moderate to common (15-20%) angular, calcined flint, mostly moderately sorted with fragments ≤ 5 mm, however rare (1%) larger grey, sub-angular, detrital pieces, ≤ 15 mm, are also present. The fresh fracture is hackly.

F8: A soft but rough fabric containing moderate (15%) calcined, angular flint, \leq 5 mm, moderately sorted, and rare (1-2%) rounded, red iron oxides, <1 mm. The fresh fracture is hackly.

F9: A soft but harsh, abrasive fabric containing very common (30%) angular, calcined flint, ≤ 5 mm, poorly sorted. There are also rare to sparse (2-3%) sub-rounded to rounded red iron oxides, ≤ 2 mm. The fresh fracture is hackly.

F10: A soft but rough fabric containing common (20%) calcined, angular flint, \leq 3 mm, moderately sorted. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F11: A soft and smooth fabric containing sparse (5-7%) angular, calcined flint, ≤ 2 mm, poorly sorted, and rare (1%) rounded, red iron oxides, ≤ 1 mm. The clay matrix is micaceous, the fresh fracture is fine.

F12: A soft but rough fabric containing very common (30%) calcined, angular flint, $\leq 2 \text{ mm}$, well sorted; rare to sparse (2-3%) sub-angular coarse-sized quartz grains, and rare (1%) angular ironstone, $\leq 1.5 \text{ mm}$. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F13: A soft but rough fabric containing common (25%) angular flint, \leq 5 mm, poorly sorted, mostly calcined although occasional detrital fragments also occur; rare (1%) rounded, red iron oxides, \leq 1.5 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular.

5.2 Grog-tempered

G5: A soft and soapy fabric containing common (20%) angular grog, ≤ 3 mm, poorly sorted; rare (2%) red, rounded iron oxides, ≤ 2 mm, but mostly ≤ 0.5 mm. Can also contain rare (1%) angular flint fragments, ≤ 4 mm. The fresh fracture is relatively fine.

5.3 Grog and flint-tempered

GF1: A soft and soapy fabric containing moderate (15%) angular, flint-tempered grog, ≤ 4 mm, moderately sorted, and sparse (5%) angular flint, ≤ 2 mm, well sorted. The clay matrix is silty and poorly wedged, the fresh fracture is fine.

GF2: A soft and soapy fabric containing common (20%) angular grog, ≤ 3 mm, moderately sorted. The fragments appear to have a silty clay matrix and contain fine flint temper. The fabric also contains sparse (5%) calcined, angular flint, ≤ 4 mm, moderately sorted, and rare (1%) red, rounded iron oxides, ≤ 1 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular.

GF3: A soft and soapy fabric containing common (20-25%) angular grog, ≤ 1 mm, well sorted; sparse (3%) angular flint, ≤ 2 mm, well sorted; rare (2%) burnt organic matter can be seen in the break. The fresh fracture is irregular.

5.4 Sandy wares

Q1: A soft and sandy fabric containing sparse (3%) angular flint, ≤ 2 mm, poorly sorted in a fine-grained sandy clay matrix.

5.5 Rock-gritted

Z1: A soft but harsh and abrasive fabric containing common (20%) sub-angular to angular quartzite, ≤ 8 mm, poorly sorted. The fresh fracture is irregular.

6 **IRON AGE FABRICS**

6.1 Flint-tempered

F14: A soft but rough fabric containing moderate to common (15-20%) angular flint, ≤ 4 mm, poorly sorted, and sparse (3%) burnt out organic material, ≤ 1 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F15: A fairly hard fabric containing common (20-25%) angular, calcined flint, mostly grey fragments, ≤ 2 mm, poorly sorted. The clay matrix is micaceous with occasional coarse-sized sub-rounded quartz grains. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F16: A soft but slightly harsh fabric containing moderate (15%) flint, both angular, calcined fragments and more rounded, orange and colourless pieces, ≤ 9 mm, most fragments are *c* 4 mm, moderately sorted. The clay matrix is silty and has been quite poorly wedged. The fresh fracture is irregular.

F17: A soft and smooth fabric containing common to very common (25-30%) calcined, angular flint, ≤ 1.5 mm, mostly ≤ 1 mm, moderately sorted; rare (1%) coarse-grained angular quartz, and sparse (3%) linear voids from burnt out organic matter, ≤ 1 mm. The clay matrix is micaceous, the fresh fracture is irregular.

6.2 Grog-tempered

G1: A soft and soapy fabric containing very common (30%) unoxidised grog, sub-angular, ≤ 3 mm, poorly sorted; sparse (5%) calcareous inclusions, ≤ 2 mm, mostly degraded and leached,

and therefore unidentifiable. There are rare (1%) rounded, red ferric inclusions, ≤ 2 mm. Sparse (3-5%) rounded, fine-grained glauconite is visible on the interior surface. The fresh fracture is irregular.

G2: A soft and soapy fabric containing common (25%) angular grog, ≤ 2 mm, well sorted; sparse (3-5%) red, rounded ferric inclusions, ≤ 3 mm, well sorted, and sparse (3-5%) burnt out linear organic inclusions, ≤ 7 mm. Sparse degraded, dissolved calcareous inclusions are also indicated. The fresh fracture is irregular.

G3: A soft and fairly smooth fabric containing moderate to common (15-20%) sub-rounded, unoxidised grog inclusions, ≤ 2 mm, moderately sorted; sparse (7%) sub-angular to angular chalk fragments, ≤ 2 mm, moderately sorted, and rare to sparse (2-3%) sub-rounded to rounded, red iron oxides, up to 3 mm. Rare (1%) medium to coarse grained sub-rounded quartz, and rare (1%) angular flint, ≤ 2 mm, are also present. The fresh fracture is irregular.

G4: A soft but slightly sandy-textured fabric containing common to very common (25-30%) sub-angular to angular grog, grey and silty, ≤ 4 mm, poorly sorted; sparse (3%) angular, medium to coarse-grained quartz, and rare (1%) inclusions of flint and ironstone, ≤ 4 mm, sub-angular. The fresh fracture is irregular.

G6: A soft and soapy fabric containing common (30%) angular, unoxidised grog, $\leq 2 \text{ mm}$, moderately sorted; sparse (3%) angular, red iron oxides, $\leq 3 \text{ mm}$, moderately sorted, and sparse (3%) rounded glauconite, fine to coarse-grained, moderately sorted. Rare (1-2%) rounded, coarse-grained quartz, rare (1%) angular flint, $\leq 2 \text{ mm}$, and rare (1%) burnt organic inclusions, $\leq 4 \text{ mm}$ were also seen. The fresh fracture is hackly.

G7: not used.

G8: A soft and soapy fabric containing a common amount (20%) of angular, mostly oxidised grog, \leq 3mm. A sparse amount (5-7%) of well-rounded and fine-sized glauconite is visible on the interior surface. The fresh fracture is irregular.

6.3 Iron-gritted

I1: A highly distinctive soft and soapy fabric containing common (25%) sub-angular red iron compound, \leq 5 mm, moderately sorted. The clay matrix is silty with the occasional coarse-sized grain of sub-rounded quartz. The fresh fracture is relatively fine.

I2: A soft and fairly smooth fabric containing moderate to common (15-20%) sub-angular, red iron compund, ≤ 2 mm, moderately sorted; sparse (7%) rounded to sub-angular unidentified argillaceous inclusions, and sparse (3%) black inclusions, ≤ 1 mm, possibly the burnt remains of organic material. The fabric also contains rare to sparse (2-3%) angular quartz fragments. The fresh fracture is irregular.

I3: A soft and slightly sandy fabric containing moderate to common (15-20%) rounded to subrounded red iron oxides, ≤ 5 mm, poorly sorted, and sparse to moderate (7-10%) angular to rounded quartz, up to coarse-sized, poorly sorted. Sparse (3%) organic material is represented by burnt out linear voids, ≤ 2 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular.

I4: A soft and silty fabric containing common rounded to sub-rounded, red iron oxides, ≤ 1.5 mm, moderately sorted; moderate to common (15-20%) well-rounded to rounded, fine to medium-grained glauconite, well sorted, and sparse (3%) quartz, mostly angular and medium-grained with occasional more rounded pieces up to 2 mm. Rare (1%) angular flint fragments, ≤ 4 mm also occur. The fresh fracture is fine.

I5: A soft and soapy fabric containing sparse to moderate (7-10%) sub-angular argillaceous inclusions, probably clay pellets, ≤ 2 mm, and sparse (5%) sub-rounded to sub-angular inclusions of red iron ore/oxides, ≤ 4 mm, moderately sorted. The clay matrix is silty, the fresh fracture is irregular.

6.4 Sandy wares

Q2: A soft and soapy fabric containing abundant (>40%) angular, medium-grained quartz, well sorted, and rare (1%) angular flint, ≤ 2 mm. The fresh fracture is hackly.

Q3: A soft and sandy fabric containing common (20%) sub-rounded to sub-angular quartz, medium to coarse-grained, moderately to well sorted; sparse (5%) medium to coarse-sized rounded, red iron oxides, well sorted. Rare (1%) burnt out organic matter, ≤ 2 mm, and rare (1%) angular, non-calcined flint, ≤ 5 mm also occur. The fresh fracture is fine.

Q4: A soft and sandy fabric containing very common (30%) well-rounded to rounded medium-grained glauconite, well sorted, and sparse to moderate (7-10%) angular, coarse-grained quartz. Rare (2%) angular flint fragments, ≤ 2 mm, are also present. The fresh fracture is hackly.

Q5: A soft and sandy fabric containing abundant (>40%) well-rounded to rounded, fine to medium-grained glauconite, and moderate to common (15-20%) clear, colourless quartz grains, sub-angular to sub-rounded, \leq 1.5 mm, poorly sorted. The fresh fracture is irregular.

Q6: A soft and sandy fabric containing moderate (10-15%) quartz, mostly sub-angular to subrounded, medium to coarse-sized grains; however, rounded, coarse to very coarse-sized grains also occur, poorly sorted. There are sparse (7%) sub-angular, red iron oxides, ≤ 2 mm, poorly sorted. The fresh fracture is relatively fine. The core appears black and the inclusions are not clearly visible, this description therefore characterises the external surface, which is more irregularly fired.

Q7: A soft and sandy fabric containing very common (30%) sub-angular to sub-rounded, medium to coarse-grained quartz, well sorted; sparse (3%) rounded, dark red shiny grains, probably glauconite, mostly fine-grained, and rare (1%) rounded iron oxides, ≤ 1 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular.

Q8: A soft and sandy fabric containing moderate (10%) sub-rounded quartz, mostly medium to coarse-sized, well sorted; sparse (7%) sub-angular, red iron oxides, \leq 3 mm, moderately sorted, and rare (1%) unidentified, leached calcareous inclusions, \leq 1 mm. The fresh fracture is fine.

Q9: Same fabric as Q8.

Q10: A soft and sandy fabric containing moderate (10%) sub-angular to sub-rounded quartz, fine to very coarse-grained, poorly sorted. Moderate (10%) rounded fine to medium-grained glauconite grains, well sorted, are visible in oxidised areas. Sparse (3%) angular iron oxides, \leq 3 mm, and sparse (3%) burnt out organic linear inclusions, \leq 7 mm, are also present. Rare (1-2%) unidentified calcareous inclusions, <3 mm, have leached out of the fabric. On the interior of the vessel 15 base (context 2213) additional large and prominent rounded quartz inclusions, \leq 5 mm are visible. The fresh fracture is irregular.

Q11: Not used.

Q12: A soft and sandy fabric containing common (25%) well rounded to rounded glauconite, fine to medium-grained, well sorted; sparse (5-7%) sub-rounded to rounded clear, colourless

quartz, coarse-grained, well sorted, and rare (1%) sub-angular, red iron oxides, ≤ 1 mm. The fresh fracture is irregular. The core is quite black in colour, the fabric description has therefore been taken from oxidised surface areas.

Q13: A soft and sandy fabric containing sparse to moderate (7-10%) sub-rounded quartz, medium to coarse-grained, well sorted, and moderate (10-15%) very fine to fine-grained glauconite, well sorted. Sparse to moderate (7-10%) light grey angular inclusions (possibly argillaceous), \leq 1.5 mm, well sorted, and rare (1%) angular flint, <4 mm, are also present. The fresh fracture is irregular.

Q14: A soft and sandy fabric containing moderate to common (15-20%) sub-angular to angular, coarse-grained quartz, well sorted. The grains are not evenly distributed throughout the fabric, and appear to have been added as temper rather than occurring naturally. There is also sparse (3-5%) calcined, angular flint, \leq 4 mm, poorly sorted. The sand component appears to include a number of fine to medium-grained glauconite grains. The fresh fracture is fine.

Q15: A soft and sandy fabric, the clay matrix contains abundant (>50%) very fine or silt-sized grains of quartz, not clearly visible at x20 power. Sparse (5-7%) sub-rounded to rounded coarse-grained quartz is also visible. The fresh fracture is fine.

Q16: A soft and sandy fabric containing very common (30%) rounded glauconite and subrounded to sub-angular quartz. The glauconite is fine to medium grained, the quartz is coarsegrained, well sorted. Common (20%) soft, black, argillaceous inclusions, containing glauconite, can also be seen. The fresh fracture is irregular.

Q17: A soft and sandy fabric containing common to very common (25-30%) medium to coarse-grained quartz, sub-angular, well sorted, and moderate (10%) sub-rounded to rounded, red iron oxides, \leq 1.5 mm, poorly sorted. The quartz component includes sparse to moderate (7-10%) well-rounded, fine-sized glauconite. The fresh fracture is irregular.

6.5 Mixed sandy wares

QV1: A soft and sandy fabric containing common (20-25%) sub-rounded quartz, mostly medium to coarse-grained, with occasional very coarse grains. Moderate (10-15%) burnt linear organic inclusions, up to 15 mm, but mostly <0.5 mm, and rare (2%) angular detrital flint fragments, <4 mm, are also present. The fresh fracture is hackly.

UQ1: A soft and slightly soapy fabric containing common (20-25%) sub-angular to angular, yellow/white coloured inclusions that do not react with hydrochloric acid, ≤ 3 mm, moderately sorted. Moderate (10%) angular quartz, coarse-grained, well sorted, and rare (1%) ironstone, sub-rounded, ≤ 8 mm, were identified. The fresh fracture is irregular.

6.6 Rock-gritted

R1: A soft but harsh fabric containing common (25%) angular quartz sandstone, $\leq 2 \text{ mm}$, moderately sorted, and sparse (3%) rounded, red iron oxides, $\leq 1 \text{ mm}$, moderately sorted. The fresh fracture is irregular.

6.7 Discussion of the fabrics

The Bronze Age pottery was dominated by flint-tempered fabrics, which account for 79% of the count of the Bronze Age fabrics and 74% of the weight (Table 5). Grog and flint-tempered, grog-tempered and sandy wares were also present, but in small quantities. The middle Bronze Age (cp1) flint-tempered fabrics were mostly coarse wares (F1-F3, F7, F12

and F13), containing a minimum of 20% burnt and crushed flint inclusions, which tend to be moderately to well sorted. One sherd from a fine ware flint-tempered vessel (F5) was also recovered. A single middle Bronze Age vessel, placed within cut [418], had been tempered with poorly sorted quartzite inclusions, with pieces up to 8 mm in size (Z1). Twenty-one body sherds of flint-tempered Deverel-Rimbury pottery (fabric F1) and 8 sherds of a very finegrained sandy fabric (Q1) were recovered from the fill of this vessel. The sandy fabric contrasted with the flint-tempered fabrics of the period, whose silty clay matrices contained quartz of too small a size to be visible using a binocular microscope. The positioning of these sherds within a middle Bronze Age vessel, however, indicates their contemporaneity. The late Bronze Age phase (cp 3) continued to be dominated by flint-tempered fabrics (F8, F9, F10 and F11), but the temper became less coarse as the vessel walls became thinner. Grog was used as the sole tempering agent for the first time (G5), and two grog and flint-tempered fabrics were also current (GF2 and GF3).

Fabric group	Bronze A	Age fabrics	Iron Ag	ge fabrics
	% of count	% of weight	% of count	% of weight
Flint-tempered	78.9	73.9	4.6	7.3
Grog-tempered	3.2	2.1	13.8	18.8
Grog and flint tempered	6.5	5.1	0	0
Iron-gritted	0	0	15.3	23.1
Sandy wares	2.2	0.3	59.9	47.1
Mixed quartz gritted	0	0	6.3	3.7
Rock-gritted	9.3	18.5	<1	<1

Table 5: Quantification (by percentage) of Bronze Age and Iron Age fabric groups

Three fabrics (F4, F6 and GF1) appear to represent developments from the Deverel-Rimbury tradition and may bridge the gap between the middle Bronze Age and late Bronze Age plain assemblage fabrics. Only two sherds of fabric F6 were identified, one isolated in ditch 1902 and the other from middle Bronze Age waterhole 245. The latter sherd differed from the bulk of the Deverel-Rimbury material within the feature as the flint-temper was more sparse, and the form was more thin-walled and closed. This waterhole also produced a coarse ware vessel (Fig. 3, No. 7) in fabric F4, densely tempered with well-sorted flint. The form is typologically somewhere between a coarse globular urn and a late Bronze Age plain ware tub-style vessel. The grog and flint tempered fabric GF1 was also identified in the same feature [245], and utilised in the manufacture of an R1 vessel (Fig. 3, No. 5). This fabric is superficially very similar in appearance to the late Bronze Age GF2, but the grog inclusions in the latter are much more pronounced, and the clay matrix of the former is more poorly wedged. In one instance, the Deverel-Rimbury fabric F3 is seen to continue slightly later, and had been used for an R1 form, recovered from pit 1049 (Fig. 3, No. 4).

The early and middle Iron Age ceramics are dominated by sandy wares and mixed sandy fabrics, which together account for 66% of the count and 51% of the weight for ceramic phases 4 and 5 (Table 5). These fabrics include both glauconite and non-glauconitic sandy wares, the glauconitic clays were used only for the middle Iron Age vessels. Iron-gritted and grog-tempered fabrics also played a significant role, representing 15% and 14% of the count respectively. Flint-tempered fabrics were still in use at the site during the Iron Age, although they now accounted for only 5% of the count.

The site lies on the Folkestone Beds of the Lower Greensand and drift deposits of Head Brickearth. To the south of the site (within 3 km) further deposits of the Lower Greensand are located, namely the Sandgate Beds, Hythe Beds and Atherfield Clay. The Weald Clay is also located within 3 km, as well as deposits of alluvium and third terrace river gravels. Immediately north of the site are the Gault, Lower and Middle Chalk and Head deposits. A swath of Clay-with-flints lies 4 km to the north of the site (information from Ordnance Survey, Geological Survey of Great Britain, Sheets 288, 289 and 305/306). These deposits could have supplied the clay and tempering agents used in the pottery fabrics. The Chalk deposits or Clay-with-flints may have been the source for the flint and chalk inclusions. The Lower Greensand and drift would have provided suitable sources for the sandy fabrics, both glauconitic and non-glauconitic wares. The origin of the quartzite is uncertain; it may have been derived from pebbles in the drift deposits. The use of quartzite has also been seen at a number of other sites along the CTRL route including Sandway Road and Saltwood Tunnel, both of which also lie on the Folkestone Beds. David Peacock has examined thin-section samples of the I1 and I2 fabrics and concluded that the rounded and angular pieces of the dark red mineral seen in the fabrics 'is an iron compound, undoubtedly an alteration product of haematite such as goethite' (pers. comm.). It may be encompassed by the term 'ironstone', found widely in the Folkestone Beds, but X-ray diffraction analysis would be required to identify the source. The compound could also derive from the Gault (ibid.).

Figure 1: Frequency of fabric groups by % of sherd count

a Bronze Age fabrics



b Iron Age fabrics



7 FORMS

Thirty-five form types were identified amongst the later prehistoric assemblage, seven of which are Bronze Age in date, the remaining 27 are from the Iron Age phases.

7.1 Bronze Age forms

R1: Convex-walled jar of neutral profile with undifferentiated rim (Fig. 3, Nos 4 and 5).

R2: Thin-walled vessel with undifferentiated, incurving rim and convex profile (Fig. 3, Nos 6 and 7).

R3: Straight-walled, bucket-shaped jar with undifferentiated rim (Fig. 3, No. 1).

R4: Upright cup/tub form with flat-topped, undifferentiated rim (Fig. 3, No. 8).

R5: Jar with long, upstanding neck creating a collar. Rim is flat-topped with fingertip impressions, shoulder area is well-defined (Fig. 3, No. 9).

R6: Upright, straight-sided jar with undifferentiated rim (Fig. 3, Nos 3 and 10), the latter displays a well-defined base (B3).

R7: Flared rim with internal bevel, vessel form is uncertain (Fig. 3, No. 11).

7.2 Discussion of Bronze Age forms

The Bronze Age form types range from Deverel-Rimbury vessels of the middle Bronze Age to late Bronze Age plain assemblage wares. The middle Bronze Age vessels were mostly represented by flint-tempered body sherds, however a single bucket-shaped jar was recovered from the subsoil (R3, Fig. 3, No. 1). This form commonly occurred in southern Britain during this period, and may be either plain or decorated with applied cordons, fingertip or fingernail impressions (Fig. 3, No. 2). The Beechbrook example is undecorated and paralleled at a number of sites in the region including Mile Oak, East Sussex (Hamilton 2002, fig. 2.30:19) and Downsview, East Sussex (ibid., fig. 7.27:8). Deverel-Rimbury bucket urns have also been recorded at Coldharbour Road, Gravesend (Barclay 1994, fig. 9.6; 9.7), one of which was found in associated with a hooked rim jar. The fabric of both vessels was similar and led the author to suggest that this association may be representative of the transition from the Deverel-Rimbury tradition to late Bronze Age plain wares (ibid., 390).

Form R1 (Fig. 3, No. 4) at Beechbrook Wood exhibits a number of similarities with the Deverel-Rimbury bucket-urns, but the form is smaller and appears to be evolving in terms of more convex-shaped walls and incurving rim. This development may be seen to culminate in a post Deverel-Rimbury jar form such as the type 7 coarse plain jar from the late Bronze Age assemblage at Reading Business Park (Hall 1992, fig. 41). At Kimpton, Hampshire, Ellison (1981) recorded three post-Deverel-Rimbury vessels in the same phase as nineteen Deverel-Rimbury globular urns, eight bucket urns and five accessory cups (Ellison 1981, 176). One of

these post Deverel-Rimbury forms (E4, ibid., fig. 19) is very similar to R1 at Beechbrook Wood. The form is described by Ellison as 'relatively thin-walled, possess a slack curving profile and incurving rim profiles and are virtually plain' (ibid., 196). She further notes that at a number of other sites, including Eldon's Seat, Dorset, and Winnall Down, Hampshire, similar vessels have been recorded in association with Deverel-Rimbury pottery. This again hints at a visible transition from middle to late Bronze Age ceramics.

Form R2 (Fig. 3, Nos 6 and 7) at Beechbrook Wood is again more convex in profile than more typical Deverel-Rimbury vessels, and the rim is incurving, creating a closed form. On morphological grounds it could therefore be placed in a late Bronze Age plain assemblage phase, and possible parallels for this form include the convex-profile jars from the late Bronze Age assemblage at Downsview (Hamilton 2002, fig. 7.28:23). The two examples from Beechbrook Wood were found in association with Deverel-Rimbury pottery in waterhole 245. The fabric of one (Fig. 00* No. 7, F4) contained frequent, well-sorted flint and would be at home in a middle Bronze Age assemblage, yet the incurving rim and thin vessel walls hint at an evolving form.

The remaining Bronze Age forms are all fairly typical of the late Bronze Age plain wares seen in southern Britain, as defined by Barrett (1980). The small, straight-sided cup/tub form (R4, Fig. 3, No. 8) is paralleled at Reading Business Park (Hall 1992, fig. 43, type 24) and Broomfield, Chelmsford (Brown 1995a, fig. 7:17; fig. 8:25, 32). R6 is similar in form, yet larger in size, and may be equated to the type 7 at Reading Business Park (Hall 1992). The form of the R7 rim is uncertain, it is internally bevelled and may be a flaring rim from a Barrett Class II jar, such as those identified at Broomfield (Brown 1995a, fig. 8:24) and Lofts Farm, Essex (Brown 1988, fig. 15.38). Alternatively the vessel may be a Class IV bowl, similar to examples from Lofts Farm (ibid, fig. 15:34). This rim form also occurred in the late Bronze Age assemblage at Runnymede (Longley 1991, fig. 97:147). Form R5 (Fig. 3, No. 9) is more unusual, but is paralleled by type 15 at Runnymede (Longley 1980, 68) and may be compared to the late Bronze Age slack-profiled jars from Queen Mary's Hospital, Carshalton (Adkins and Needham 1985, fig. 3:1, 3, 5).

7.3 Iron Age forms

R8: Flat-topped, squared and undifferentiated rim from neutral/open form (Fig. 3, No. 13).

R10: Convex-profile vessel with flat-topped rim displaying finger cabling. The neck area is slightly shaped (Fig. 3, No. 15).

R11: Short, upright rim from high-shouldered bowl (Fig. 3, No. 16).

R9: Slightly incurving, undifferentiated rim from open profile vessel, probable bowl (Fig. 3, No. 14).

R12: High-shouldered, large, squat jar with gently out-turned rim (Fig. 4, No. 18).

R13: Gently out-turned rim on large, round-bodied jar (Fig. 4, No. 19).

R14: Large, slack-sided jar with externally thickened rim, slightly bevelled (Fig. 4, No. 20).

R15: Bucket-shaped vessel with wide orifice, narrow base and undifferentiated rim (Fig. 6, No. 33).

R16: Globular, necked, S-profiled jar with out-turned rim (Fig. 5, Nos 21, 22, 27, 29, Fig. 6, No. 31, Fig. 7, Nos 44, 46, 47, 60, 62, 63, Fig. 8, Nos 72 and 85).

R17: Convex-profile vessel with incurving rim and rounded internal bevel (Fig. 5, No. 23).

R18: Fairly crudely made bucket-shaped vessel with wide orifice and slightly incurving rim (Fig. 5, No. 24, Fig. 8, No. 69).

R19: Small saucepan pot style vessel with slack/straight sides, incurving towards the top. The rim has a gently rounded, internal bevel (Fig. 5, Nos 25, 28, 30, Fig. 6, Nos 38, 40, Fig. 7, No. 48, Fig. 8, No. 73, Fig. 9, No. 91).

R20: Not used.

R21: Saucepan pot with straight upper walls and undifferentiated, flattened rim. A more developed version of form R19 (Fig. 5, No. 26, Fig. 6, No. 32, Fig. 7, Nos 54, 55, Fig. 8, Nos 75, 78 and 83).

R22: S-profile bowl with everted rim and slight footring base (Fig. 6, No. 34, Fig. 7, No. 57).

R23: Incurving, rounded, undifferentiated rim on high-shouldered bowl of ovoid profile (Fig. 6, Nos 35, 36, Fig. 7, No. 49, Fig. 8, No. 68).

R24: Globular cup form with rounded, everted rim (Fig. 6, No. 37).

R25: Vessel with medium-length concave neck and out-turned rim, profile unknown (Fig. 7, Nos 43, 61, Fig. 8, No. 74).

R26: S-profile jar with rounded, gently everted rim and concave neck, a smaller, more thinwalled version of form R16 (Fig. 7, No. 41).

R27: Flat-topped, upright rim from medium-necked vessel, probably a jar (Fig. 6, No. 39, Fig. 7, No. 42).

R28: Well-formed shallow bowl with rounded sides, out-turned rim and omphalos base (Fig. 8, No. 71).

R29: High-shouldered, round-bodied jar with short neck and upright, rounded rim (Fig. 4, No. 17, Fig. 7, No. 45).

R30: Barrel-shaped jar with short, upright or slightly everted rim (Fig. 7, No. 50, Fig 8, Nos 64, 76, 84).

R31: Jar with thickened, flat-topped rim, profile unknown (Fig. 9, No. 94).

R32: Round-bellied bowl with concave, medium-length neck and slightly everted rim (Fig. 8, No. 87).

R33: Hemispherical bowl with undifferentiated or slightly everted rim (Fig. 8, Nos 81, 82, 86, 90).

R34: Incurving, pinched rim with internal bevel, vessel profile is unknown (Fig. 8, No. 66).

R35: Large, coarse ware jar with rolled-over, beaded rim (Fig. 9, No. 92).

R36: Barrel-shaped jar with flat-topped, thickened rim (Fig. 8, No. 80).

The early Iron Age forms identified from Beechbrook Wood are fairly typical for southern England. R8 (Fig. 3, No. 13) and R9 (Fig. 3, No. 14) are similar vessels in terms of the openness of their form, with parallels at Southend, Essex (Brown 1995b, fig. 8:4) and Cliffe, Kent (Trow and Cameron 1998, fig. 18 no. 18). Form R10 (Fig. 3, No. 15) is similar to an early Iron Age–early/middle Iron Age vessel from Ebbsfleet, Thanet (Macpherson-Grant 1992, fig. 6:12). Form R11 (Fig. 3, No. 16) may be compared to a vessel from Southend (Brown 1995b, fig. 8:7), while the finger-impressed cabling present on form R10 also finds parallels amongst the Southend assemblage.

7.4 Discussion of Iron Age forms

The middle Iron Age vessels form a clear group, dominated by jars and bowls with rounded, flowing sides, often with everted rims, and vessels that may be encompassed by Cunliffe's 'saucepan pot continuum', seen in much of southern England, including 'Sussex, Hampshire, Wiltshire, Surrey, Berkshire, Somerset, Gloucestershire' and parts of Wales (Cunliffe 1991, 79-82). This tradition appeared during the 4th century and had ended by approximately 100 BC, although the precise chronology varied from region to region (ibid., 82). The assemblage also shares a number of traits with the Mucking-Crayford style of the Thames estuary (ibid., 579).

The assemblage therefore draws a wide-range of parallels from southern England. The form R21 (Fig. 5, No. 26) saucepan pot has, until now, been rarely seen in Kent. However, occasional examples have been recorded at Bigberry (Thompson 1983, fig. 11:65) and Farningham Hill (Couldrey 1984, fig. 15:28). Further afield, the form is paralleled by Danebury form PA2.1, characterised by vessels whose upper walls are straight and lower walls curve gently to the base. The rims tend to be flat-topped, and the surfaces are well-finished (Brown 2000, 90). The form is current in Danebury ceramic phases (cp) 4-6, c 360-270 BC (ibid.). Form R19 (Fig. 5, No. 25) at Beechbrook is a less well-developed example of the form, and paralleled by PA1.1 at Danebury, dated c 470-310 BC, and described as 'vessels with sides incurving slightly towards the top, usually with undifferentiated rims' (Brown 2000, 90). In total, eleven examples of form R19 and nine of form R21 were

identified. Forms R15 (Fig. 6, No. 33) and R18 (Fig. 5, No. 24) are also neutral in profile, and may be described as bucket-shaped vessels. Parallels for these include Form 6 at Little Waltham (Beechbrook Wood R15), while Little Waltham Form 9, present during Period II (mid 3d to late 2nd century) parallels Beechbrook Wood form R18 (Drury 1978, 52-4). A comparison for R18 may also be seen at Cliffe, Kent (Trow and Cameron 1998, fig. 20 no. 34).

The S-profiled jars (R16: Fig. 6, No. 31; and R26: Fig. 7, No. 41) were the second most commonly occurring form at Beechbroook Wood, and are paralleled at a number of other middle Iron Age sites including Cliffe, Kent (Trow and Cameron 1998, fig. 20 nos 31-32) and Danebury (form JD 3.1, cp 6-7, 310-50 BC). Form 13 at Little Waltham may be compared to Beechbrook R16. It was most common during Period III, late 2nd to mid 1st century, but earlier (Period II) and later (Period IV) examples also occur (Drury 1978, fig. 47, 176). Bowl versions of this form include R22 (Fig. 6, No. 34) and R32 (Fig. 8, No. 87). S-profiled bowls are present at Little Waltham (Form 14), most commonly occurring during Period II (Drury 1978). Hemispherical bowl forms R23 (Fig. 6, No. 35) and R33 (Fig. 8, No. 90) are seen on a number of sites in the region, again including Little Waltham (Form 15, Period II) and Site 8 of the A2 route, recovered from a 5th to 3rd century ditch (Macpherson-Grant 1980, fig. 17.91; fig. 18.102). This form is fairly common at Farningham Hill, where it is encompassed in Form 1A (Couldrey 1984). The small bowl/dish form R28 (Fig. 8, No. 71) is rarely seen in assemblages from Kent, but again a similar vessel was found at Farningham Hill. It is of a comparably small size, with rounded body and omphalos base; the rim form differs however, and is beaded (Couldrey 1984, fig. 15:28).

Barrel-shaped jars were present at Beechbrook Wood in forms R30 (Fig. 7, No. 50) and R36 (Fig. 8, No. 80). Barrel-shaped jars are widely seen during the middle Iron Age, with large numbers occurring in the Upper Thames Valley, for example. The 3rd century assemblage from Mingies Ditch, Oxfordshire, produced parallels for forms R30 (Wilson 1993, fig. 34, 13 and 17) and R36 (ibid., fig. 34, 11). The high-shouldered globular jar form R29 is also paralleled at Mingies Ditch (ibid., fig. 35, 26). Forms R12 (Fig. 4, No. 18) and R13 (Fig. 4, No. 19) from Beechbrook Wood are similar vessels, both large, squat jars with gently everted rims, but the widest point on R13 is lower than the widest point of R12. The single example of form R17 (Fig. 5, No. 23) is a smaller version of R12 and has therefore been grouped with these vessels for the purposes of analysis. Form R12 is paralleled by Danebury form JC2.1, cp 5-7, 350-50 BC (Brown 2000). A smaller version of the form may also be seen in Form 5 at Little Waltham, most common during Period III, late 2nd to mid 1st century (Drury 1978). Parallels for R13 may also be drawn from Little Waltham Form 11, present during Periods II, III and IV, from the mid 3rd century to the third quarter of the 1st century (ibid.). Form R14 (Fig. 4, No. 20) is a large jar with wide orifice and thickened rim,

and is comparable to examples from Barham Downs (Macpherson-Grant 1980, fig. 6.28). A further possible parallel for the form exists at Farningham Hill (Couldrey 1984, fig. 20:144). Form R35 (Fig. 9, No. 92) is a jar of similar size but with an out-turned rim, also paralleled at Farningham Hill (ibid., fig. 19:110).

A number of footring and pedestal base forms were present in the Beechbrook assemblage. At Barham Downs, Cunliffe places the use of footring bases in a 5th to 3rd century date bracket (Cunliffe 1980, 179). They are also present at Site 8 of the A2 works during the same period (Macpherson-Grant 1980, fig. 18.97). The footring/pedestal bases of Fig. 7, No. 56 and Fig. 8, Nos 88-89 are reflected in Danebury form JD2, cp 3-5, 470-310 BC (Brown 2000, fig. 3.23, SF 158).

Pottery assemblages which can be assigned to the middle Iron Age are rare in Kent. Macpherson-Grant (1991, 43) has commented that the middle Iron Age trends seen in central, southern and eastern England are not well represented in Kent. Decorated S-profiled jars from Grenham Bay, Birchington and Margate are illustrated as typical of the type of forms one might expect during this period (ibid., 44). Collections characterised by S-profile vessels and footring bowls have been identified in the county at sites such as Farningham Hill, Crayford and Oldbury, but the 'chronological range of this type of assemblage is not yet firmly established' (Champion, forthcoming). The Oldbury group was recovered from a gully fill and soil layer thought to overlie a hearth, a radiocarbon date from the latter (BM 2292-1910+80 BP) led Thompson to suggest a date range of 150-50 BC for the pottery group (Thompson 1986, 283). The radiocarbon date was later revised as BM 2292R 2210+140 BP, 400-100 cal BC (Clark and Thompson 1989, 304). At Bigberry, S-profiled jars are considered 'representative of 'early' types' in mixed assemblages for which a date range of c 150-50 BC is again tentatively suggested (Thompson 1983, 255 and fig. 10:2 and 19). The assemblage from Farningham Hill has been assigned a slightly later date (50 BC-AD 50) (Couldrey 1984, 38). At Beechbrook Wood, S-profiled jars and bowls are found in the same context (2213, ditch 2150) as saucepan pots. A charcoal sample from the primary fill of the recut of this ditch (sub-group 7001), physically located immediately above context 2213, produced a radiocarbon date of 390-170 cal BC. This would suggest that in this area of Kent, S-profiled vessels and saucepan pots occur no later than the mid 2nd century BC. It is possible that the forms were quite long-lived, but the dating of similar forms at Farningham Hill and Oldbury may be too late.

7.5 Vessel bases

The following base forms were identified in the later prehistoric assemblage. Separate codes were not used to distinguish between Bronze Age and Iron Age vessels; the B1 form therefore spans both periods.

- B1: A plain base (Fig. 4, No. 18).
- B2: Plain base from a straight-walled vessel (Fig. 3, No. 8).
- B3: Well defined base with a concave wall -base join (Fig. 3, No. 10).
- B4: Very slight footring base, from S-profile bowl (Fig. 6, No. 34).
- B5: Footring/low pedestal base (Fig. 7, No. 56).
- B6: Flat base with protruding foot (Fig. 7, No. 51).

7.6 Fabric and Form

The occurrence of each form in the various fabrics types has been presented in Table 6. Most forms were not found in sufficient quantities to determine if specific fabrics were being selected for certain forms. Those with more than five examples (R16, R19, R21 and R30) did not demonstrate any particular patterns, with flint, iron or quartz-gritted fabrics utilised in the manufacture of S-profiled jars (R16), grog, iron and quartz fabrics used for saucepan pots (R19 and R21) and iron or quartz fabrics for the barrel-shaped jars (R30).

Table 6: Correlation of form to fabric

	Fabr	ric																															
Form	F3	F4	F6	F8	F9	F10	F14	F16	G1	G2	G3	G4	GF1	GF2	GF3	II	12	I3	14	15	Q2	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q10	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q17	QVI	UQ1	Tot- al
R1	1												1																				2
R2		1	1																														2
R3	1																																1
R4						1																											1
R5														1																			1
R6				1	1																												2
R7															1																		1
R8																															1		1
R9																					1												1
R10																															1		1
R11																															1		1
R12											1																						1
R13							1									1																	2
R14							1																										1
R15																										1							1
R16							1	1									1	1	1			3		1	5					1		1	16
R17																		1															1
R18																						1					1						2
R19									2	1										2		4	2										11
R21									2							1			1			3			2								9
R22																						1			1								2
R23																2											2	1					5
R24																			1														1
R25										2						1																	3
R26																						1											1
R27										1						1									2								4
R28												1																					1
R29																									3								3
R30																			2			2			1				1				6
R31							1																										1
R32																									1								1
R33							1													1				2									4
R34									1																								1
R35							1																										1
R36																1																	1
1	2	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	5	4	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	2	5	3	1	15	2	3	15	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	93

8 DECORATION

The Beechbrook Wood assemblage was largely undecorated. Amongst the Bronze Age material decoration was limited to fingertip/nail impressions and the application of cordons. Two flint-tempered sherds from a bucket urn utilised both techniques, having a horizontal cordon decorated with fingertip impressions (Fig. 3, No. 2). A further middle Bronze Age body sherd had been decorated with a plain cordon. Of the two examples of the middle to late Bronze Age transitional form, R1, one had fingertip impressions on the top of the rim (Fig. 3, No. 4). Fingertip impressions were also recorded on a late Bronze Age body sherd from context 1197 (ditch 1972). The late Bronze Age grog and flint tempered form R5 (Fig. 3, No. 9) had been decorated with fingertip impressions on the top of the rim.

The early Iron Age vessels were mostly plain, with only one incidence of fingerimpressed cabling (Fig. 3, No. 15). The middle Iron Age assemblage was also dominated by plain wares. Nine vessels displayed characteristics of the East Midlands scored tradition, as described by Elsdon (1992). This tradition is highly variable in its form and execution and tends to be classified as decorative, although it is possible that it is actually a surface treatment designed to create a roughened surface and improve grip. It is thought to have its origins in the 4th century BC, but it continued in use until the late Iron Age (ibid., 2-3). This form of surface marking is present in the middle Iron Age Breedon-Ancaster group (Cunliffe 1991, fig. A.9). At Little Waltham it can be seen on a number of vessels from Period II, the mid 3rd to late 2nd centuries BC (Drury 1978, fig. 42, 17 and 26) to Period IV, the third quarter of the 1st century BC (ibid., fig. 52, 300 and 303), and is again present at Farningham Hill (Couldrey 1984, fig. 19:118 and 119). The Beechbrook examples include regularly applied, narrow-spaced combing (Fig. 8, Nos 70 and 99) and more widely-spaced combing (Fig. 7, No. 58, Fig. 8, No. 65). Combing was also recognised on three vessels that have not been illustrated (PRN 1427, context 2360; PRN 1515, context 2187; PRN 1658, unstratified). A similar, but more shallow, effect had also been created on one sherd (Fig. 9, No. 97), possibly using grass or twigs. The interior of this sherd, and one displaying wide combing, had been smoothed. The external surface of a vessel base recovered from pit 2366, within enclosure ditch 2150, had also been marked with irregular lines, which again appear to have been applied using twigs or grass (Fig. 9, No. 96). The interior of the vessel had been burnished. The fabric of this base (Q5) is also found amongst the vessels from ditch 2150 and it is therefore not unreasonable to assume that this technique was being used during the middle Iron Age phase at the site.

Additionally, the surfaces of three vessels had been irregularly 'scratched' using a sharp point (Fig. 7, No. 59, Fig. 9, No. 98; PRN 1453, context 2297 is not illustrated). One rim had been scored with deeper lines (Fig. 8, No. 74). A sharp point had also been used to

incise decorative lines on a vessel in context 2271, ditch 7001 (Fig. 8, No. 88). Two horizontal lines, c 12 mm apart, had been applied around the neck of the vessel, and between them short diagonal strokes were visible. A wide, blunt tool had been employed to create shallow tooled lines on two vessels (Fig. 7, No. 48, and PRN 1625, context 2305, not illustrated). Two sherds from context 2213 had been decorated with tooled lines which probably formed part of a curvilinear design (Fig. 7, No. 53). They represented the only decorative component in the large assemblage recovered from this context.

9 SURFACE TREATMENT

Just under half of the later prehistoric assemblage had some form of surface treatment (316 records out of a possible 677, Tables 7 and 8). The relationship between the form types and surface treatments is presented in Table 9. The Bronze Age vessels showed the most limited use of surface treatment (Table 7). The middle Bronze Age (cp 1) sherds were occasionally wiped on one or both surfaces (three vessels); burnishing was used only on the single globular urn body sherd (F5 fabric) and the interior of the fine-grained sandy fabric, Q1. The base of one middle Bronze Age vessel (from pit 204) had been sat on a bed of burnt, crushed flint. Two vessels which represent a middle to late Bronze Age transitional phase (cp 2, form R1) had been either wiped on both surfaces (Fig. 3, No. 4) or burnished on the exterior (Fig. 3, No. 5). The late Bronze Age vessels (cp 3) display much the same range of techniques with seven recorded instances of wiping (using cloth, grass or the potter's fingers) on both surfaces (including form R5, Fig. 3, No. 9 and R6, Fig. 3, No. 10) and two of wiping on the exterior. There was a single example of burnishing on both surfaces, one of burnishing on the interior, and one of smoothing on the interior (form R4, Fig. 3, No. 8). The R4 vessel may originally have been burnished but is now too abraded for this to be clearly identified.

Surface treatment	No. of records
Wiped, both surfaces	9
Wiped, exterior only	4
Burnished, both surfaces	2
Burnished, exterior only	2
Burnished, interior only	1
Smoothed, interior	1
Basal flints	1
Total number of records	20

Table 7: Occurrence of surface treatments on Bronze Age vessels, by number of records

During the Iron Age phases there was an increase in the incidence of detailed finishing of vessel surfaces (Table 8). The early Iron Age vessels (cp 4) are sandy in texture, and there are two recorded instances of burnishing on both surfaces, one of burnishing on the interior and one of smoothing on both surfaces. The middle Iron Age vessels are usually well-

finished, with an emphasis on burnished or smoothed surfaces. Five vessels, and a small number of body sherds, had been roughened on their lower exterior surfaces, a technique which was used in conjunction with burnishing or smoothing on the upper exterior. This form of surface treatment was selected for three ovoid profile vessels (form R23: Fig. 6, Nos 35, 36, Fig. 7, No. 49), a small S-profile jar (form R26: Fig. 7, No. 41) and a barrel-shaped jar (form R30: Fig. 8, No. 64. Whilst none of these examples could be described as rustication, the deliberate addition of clay to the vessel's surface, they may represent a derivative of the technique. Rustication originated on the Continent and has been recorded from a number of sites in Kent in the period from the late Bronze Age/early Iron Age into the early/middle Iron Age. Roughening of a vessel's surface may have been designed to ease transport of the vessel, as 'a rough surface provides a more secure grip' (Rice 1987, 232). Combing, discussed in the section on decoration, may have been employed for a similar reason.

Surface treatment	No. of records				
BU, both surfaces	39				
BU, exterior only	38				
BU, interior only	9				
BU, top of rim and upper exterior	1				
BU, top of rim and upper interior	1				
BU, exterior and upper interior	2				
BU exterior, SM interior	16				
BU interior, SM exterior	7				
BU exterior and upper interior, SM lower interior	2				
BU upper vessel, SM lower vessel	1				
BU exterior, SM and WP interior	1				
BU upper exterior, RG lower exterior, SM interior	5				
BU upper exterior, RG lower exterior	1				
BU upper exterior, WP lower exterior	1				
SM, both surfaces	84				
SM, exterior only	46				
SM, interior only	26				
SM interior, WP exterior	4				
SM lower vessel, WP upper vessel	1				
SM and WP interior	1				
SM interior, RG exterior	3				
WP, exterior	4				
WP, interior	2				
Total number of records	295				

Table 8: Occurrence of surface treatments on Iron Age vessels, by number of records

As many of the forms are represented by only one or two examples, there can be little discussion of the correlation between certain forms and surface treatments, but some comment may be made about the more frequently occurring forms (Table 9). The S-profile jar form, R16, has surface treatments on 14 out of 16 examples, including burnishing, smoothing and wiping, and suggests that consistent care was taken when finishing these vessels. The saucepan pots, R19 and R21, were again carefully finished, with six out of eleven R19 forms having burnishing or smoothing, whilst all nine of the more developed R21 vessels had well-

finished surfaces, with five smoothed or burnished on both surfaces. Each example of barrelshaped jar form R30 had been carefully finished. The increase in the employment of surface treatments during the Iron Age coincides with a change in the range of fabrics utilised, as well as in the styles of the vessels. Burnishing is a labour intensive technique, involving polishing of the surfaces whilst leather-hard or dry (Rice 1987, 138). On a purely practical basis the switch from the dominant use of harsh, flint-tempered fabrics to a range of smoother pastes, including grog-tempered, sand and iron-gritted ones, may have made burnishing and smoothing much easier and safer, and therefore more viable. The widespread adoption of the technique may also have been a response to changes in food preparation methods, requiring vessels with less permeable surfaces and therefore more able to hold liquids. Burnishing may also have created more aesthetically pleasing vessels whose surfaces could reflect light in much the same manner as metal vessels. These pots may have played a role in communal meals or feasts and therefore social relations. Table 9: Occurrence of surface treatments in each form class

D1	BU ext.	BU int.	BU both surfaces	BU ext, SM int.	SM ext., BU int.	SM ext	SM int.	SM both surfaces	WP both surfaces	WP ext., SM int.	WP upper vessel, SM lower vessel	BU upper vessel, SM lower vessel	FWP ext.	WP ext., SM int.	BU ext. + upper int.	BU upper ext., WP lower int.	BU upper ext., RG lower ext., SM int.	BU upper ext., RG lower ext.	FWP ext., SM int.	Total no. of vessels
	1								1											2
R2 D3															-					0
R4							1													1
R5							1		1											1
R6									1											1
R7																				0
R8																				0
R9																				0
R10																				0
R11		1																		1
R12										1										1
R13											1	1								2
R14										1										1
R15													1							1
R16	2		2	3				2		1		1		1	2					14
R17																				0
R18	2																			2
R19	1		2		1			1								1				6
R21	2		3	1				2		1										9
R22				2																2
R23								1									2	1		4
R24					1															1
R25								1											1	2
R26																	1			1
R27								2							ļ	ļ	ļ			2
R28	1			1							1				1					1

	BU ext.	BU int.	BU both surfaces	BU ext, SM int.	SM ext., BU int.	SM ext	SM int.	SM both surfaces	WP both surfaces	WP ext., SM int.	WP upper vessel, SM lower vessel	BU upper vessel, SM lower vessel	FWP ext.	WP ext., SM int.	BU ext. + upper int.	BU upper ext., WP lower int.	BU upper ext., RG lower ext., SM int.	BU upper ext., RG lower ext.	FWP ext., SM int.	Total no. of vessels displaying surface treatment	Total no. of vessels in form class
R29			2																	2	3
R30		1		1	1	1									1		1			6	6
R31																				0	1
R32																				0	1
R33							1													1	4
R34																				0	1
R35																				0	1
R36			1																	1	1
	8	2	10	8	3	1	2	9	3	4	1	2	1	1	3	1	4	1	1	65	93

10 EVIDENCE OF USE

Of the 699 pottery records, 74 demonstrated some indication of the actual use of the vessels (Tables 10 and 11). The most commonly occurring forms of evidence were sooting on the exterior of the vessel walls (SO) and burnt residue on the interior (RS). The former indicates that the vessel was used over an open fire (Hally 1983, 10), the latter derives from charred food (Skibo 1992), therefore either may be taken as evidence that the vessel in question was used in the cooking process. There are of course exceptions to this rule, such as vessels placed near a fire but not actually used for cooking. Two instances of burnt residue were recorded on middle Bronze Age body sherds. From contexts more broadly dated to the middle to late Bronze Age one record of burnt residue was identified and a further three records with only traces of sooting or burnt residue were also noted. There are nine records of late Bronze Age vessels displaying evidence of being used as cooking pots, but in seven of these cases only very small amounts of soot or residue were present. Traces of soot were recorded on the exterior of a form R6 vessel (Fig. 3, No. 10) and burnt residue was present inside the R4 vessel (Fig. 3, No. 8).

Table 10: Evidence of use on Bronze Age vessels

Evidence of use	No. of records
Burnt residue	3
Traces of burnt residue	6
Traces of sooting	6
Total number of records with use evidence	15

Table 11: Evidence of use on Iron Age vessels

Evidence of use	No. of records
Burnt residue	24
Traces of burnt residue	6
Sooting	14
Traces of sooting	3
Burnt residue and sooting	7
Sooting and internal abrasion	1
Internal pitting	4
Total number of records with use evidence	59

There was only one record of burnt residue in the early Iron Age assemblage, but 58 middle Iron Age records demonstrated evidence of use. Pitting was noted in four records, all in fabric Q8, one of which was identified as a barrel-shaped jar (form R30). This fabric contained small amounts of calcareous inclusions and it is presumably these that had leached from the fabric. Pitting is usually caused by a reaction between calcareous inclusions and any acidic contents of the vessel. Abrasion, caused by repeated stirring and scraping, was demonstrated on the lower interior of the R12 vessel from context 2213. As the complete profile of this vessel was reconstructable the patterns of abrasion were clearly visible. The interior of the vessel had been smoothed, but stirring and scraping had damaged the surface

around the lower walls and the edges of the base. The central area of the base had not been affected, suggesting that stirring most commonly occurred around the edges. Sooting was present around the upper exterior of this vessel and suggests it was used as a cooking pot.

Sooting alone was noted on 14 middle Iron Age records, a further three records demonstrated only traces of sooting. The vessels with sooting include single examples of forms R14, R25, R27and R30, and five of form R16. Burnt residue was noted in 24 records, while an addition five had only very small amounts of residue. Identifiable forms displaying burnt residue without sooting include R15, R16, R19 and R23 and two R30s. Sooting and burnt residue were found together on seven records including forms R13, R26 and two R19s. The following vessels can therefore be said to have been used for cooking at some point in their lives; R12; R13; R14; R15; R16 (x6); R19 (x3); R23; R26; R27 and R30 (x3). However, the infrequency with which such forms occur renders it meaningless to interpret a certain class or form as being designed specifically with a cooking purpose in mind.

11 VESSEL SIZE



Figure 2: Histogram of rim diameters, presented in 2cm intervals.

The vessel diameters varied in size from 9 cm to 37 cm, and are presented to the nearest 2 cm interval (rounding down), in Fig. 2. There is a clear concentration of vessels within a range of 12-20 cm. The focus of the assemblage would therefore appear to be with vessels that may be described as small to medium in size. Vessels with a rim diameter of less than 10 cm, classified (according to the route-wide methodology) as very small, occur only once, in the middle Iron Age cup form R24. Fifty vessels have been classified as small (10-19 cm diameter), 29 are medium in size (20-29 cm diameter), and only three may be described as large (30-40 cm). There was no clear distinctions between the size ranges of the Bronze Age

and Iron Age vessels, although the Bronze Age diameters tended to focus on the medium range. The small numbers of vessels identified within each form class does not allow any detailed correlation between the types of vessels and the sizes in which they were manufactured. Those forms represented by more than five examples reflect the general trends of the assemblage, with form R16 ranging from 12 cm to 28 cm in diameter; R19 from 13 cm to 20 cm; R21 from 12 cm to 25 cm, and R30 exclusively from 13 cm to 14 cm. Form R19 is also consistent in size, with five out of seven measurable diameters occurring between 13-15 cm, suggesting that this form of saucepan pot was nearly always produced in small sizes.

Eleven complete profiles could be reconstructed, ten from middle Iron Age vessels, and one from a late Bronze Age form. The capacities of these vessels, when full, have been calculated by Tom Goskar (Wessex Archaeology) using 3D Studio Max 5 (Table 12). A wide range is evident, from the 0.2 litres of shallow dish form R28, to the 12.8 litres of the large, squat jar form R12. Most of the calculable capacities are around one to two litres and these vessels may therefore be considered as cooking or serving vessels designed for one or two people. Soot around the shoulder of the form R12 jar, and abrasion from stirring or scraping around the lower interior, suggests that this vessel was used as a cooking vessel rather than a storage pot. It can there be assumed that it was used in the preparation of meals on a communal or group scale, possibly at a time of feasting.

PRN	Context	Vessel no.	Catalogue no.	Form	Capacity (litres)
1097	2213	1	18	R12	12.786
1116	2213	7	24	R18	1.373
1117	2213	8	25	R19	1.269
1118	2213	9	26	R21	2.849
1123	2213	13	30	R19	1.045
1126	2213	15	32	R21	2.225
1128	2213	17	34	R22	1.142
1138	2213	24	41	R26	1.351
1366	2358	n/a	58	R28	0.246
1428	2357	n/a	71	R21	3.538
1034	446	n/a	8	R4	0.653

Table 12: Vessel capacities

12 DISCUSSION

Fifteen of the excavated features at Beechbrook Wood contained pottery solely typical of the middle Bronze Age Deverel-Rimbury ceramic tradition (Table 1). Of these, five produced key groups of more than 25 sherds and may therefore be considered reliable for dating (PCRG 1997, 21). The key groups derived from pit features (195, 204, 249, 418 and 551) spread across the site. Pit 551 was the most northerly, located in Target Area C. To the east, in Bronze Age activity area 1952, pits 204 and 247 were situated, adjacent to pit 231 which contained two sherds of middle Bronze Age pottery. Pit 204 appeared to contain an in situ

34

vessel, represented by a base with basal flints, and cordoned body sherds. To the south, in Target Area A, activity area 2440, the base of a quartzite-tempered vessel (403) was discovered, placed within cut 418. The fabric of this vessel was unique for the site, and its fill contained 21 sherds of flint-tempered pottery and eight sandy sherds. It is unknown whether the vessels recovered from pits 204 and 418 had been placed in the ground as special deposits, or purely on practical grounds, possibly for below-ground storage. To the south-west, in activity area 2442, pit 456 produced a single sherd of middle Bronze Age pottery. Further west again, in the area excavated as ARC BWD 98, 25 sherds of middle Bronze Age date were recovered from pit 175. A single sherd of Deverel-Rimbury pottery was also recorded from ditch 207, located to the west of pit 175.

The assemblage from waterhole 245, located in Bronze Age activity area 1952 (adjacent to pits 204, 231 and 237), was dominated by body sherds typical of the middle Bronze Age, but several of the fabrics and forms recovered from this feature were less typical and are indicative of a transitional phase. These include form R1 (Fig. 3, No. 5) which is more convex in profile than the Deverel-Rimbury vessels, and was made from a grog and flinttempered fabric, rather than the more typical flint fabrics. Another rim sherd (R2, Fig. 3, No. 6) was flint-tempered, but the inclusions were more sparse, and the vessel walls much thinner, than the bulk of the material from this feature. The fabric of another example of this form (Fig. 3, No. 7) had been tempered with abundant well-sorted flint and therefore shares characteristics with the middle Bronze Age traditions in terms of fabric, and the later ceramics in terms of form. The presence of middle Bronze Age pottery of the Deverel-Rimbury tradition, in association with pottery which may be viewed as transitional between the middle and late Bronze Age periods, is a phenomenon that has been recognised on other sites along the CTRL route, as well as at other sites in Kent (eg Coldharbour Road, Barclay 1994) and southern Britain (Pingewood, Bradley 1985, and Kimpton, Ellison 1981). With the exception of the key-groups recovered from pits 1220 (located in activity area 1952) and 1331 (located west of 1952 and south of middle Bronze Age pit 551), the late Bronze Age pottery was sparsely distributed in features across the site.

In summary, the Bronze Age pottery spans the later part of the middle Bronze Age to the early stages of the late Bronze Age. A broad radiocarbon date from feature 1294, calibrated to 1270-990 BC, was not associated with any pottery, but is in keeping with the trends recognised in the Bronze Age assemblage. The vessels were in flint-tempered fabrics, with grog found in combination with flint during the transitional phase, and pure grog temper introduced into fabrics of the late Bronze Age. The forms evolve from the straight-walled bucket urns to thinner-walled vessels with convex profiles, and then to plain assemblage tub and jar forms, and the collared R5. Decoration is limited to fingertip/nail impressions and cordons, and surface treatment is rarely seen, consisting of wiping and occasionally burnishing or smoothing where present.

The early Iron Age material was recovered from a single feature, which appeared to represent the truncated remains of a ditch [2019]. The pottery was extremely abraded, but four vessel forms could be identified. The lack of other features containing material of this date suggests limited use of the site during this period. In addition, a hiatus in activity may be suggested from the early part of the late Bronze Age to the early Iron Age. The later prehistoric pottery assemblage was dominated by middle Iron Age pottery, accounting for 77% of the total number of sherds and 72% of the weight. The vast majority of this was associated with enclosure 3072, located at the south-eastern edge of Target Area A. All other features that produced middle Iron Age pottery did so in very small quantities, in each case less than ten sherds. These included ditches 1027, 1907, 1957, 2025, 2149 and 2303, pit 2023 and postholes 1532, 2197, 2219 and 2375.

Few internal features were identified within enclosure 3072, and only two contained later prehistoric pottery. Posthole 2321 contained one small sherd of middle Iron Age date, and pit 2366 contained 15 sherds, weighing 226 g. The fabrics identified from pit 2366 suggest that this feature was contemporary with the enclosure ditch. The outer enclosure ditch (sub-group 2151) produced only 36 sherds (154 g), and there was no evidence to suggest that it was not contemporary with the inner enclosure ditch, as both contained pottery of similar fabrics. Quantities of middle Iron Age material were also recovered from the entranceway ditches associated with the outer enclosure: sub-group 2432 contained 25 sherds, 2434 produced 14 sherds and 62 sherds were recovered from sub-group 2435. Again the similarities in the fabrics between these three entranceway ditches and the inner and outer enclosure ditches, did not permit any refinement of the phasing.

The inner enclosure ditch of 3072 (sub-group 2150) produced the largest quantity of material from the site, totalling 1440 sherds weighing 21473 g, recovered from 16 interventions through the ditch. The pottery was not evenly distributed around the ditch. Very little was recovered from the south-western and western areas, with the exception of intervention 2254, located at the back of the enclosure opposite the entranceway, which produced 35 sherds weighing 307 g. The north-eastern and eastern areas of the ditch produced reasonable quantities of material in each excavated slot: intervention 2259 (25 sherds), intervention 2338 (76 sherds), intervention 2300 (58 sherds), intervention 2259 (35 sherds), intervention 2212 (1097 sherds) and intervention 2355 (57 sherds). The ditch terminals were remodelled with recuts visible stretching from intervention 2259 to the terminus on the north-eastern side (2173, recut as 2188), and from 2246 to the terminus of the south-eastern side (2005, recut as 2006). Again the deposition of pottery in these later ditch sections was

concentrated on the north-eastern side, with the recut of 2259 (intervention 2268) producing 201 sherds, and the recut of 2355 (intervention 7030) containing 220 sherds.

At Winnall Down, Hampshire, Hill has demonstrated that the material deposited in the enclosure ditch was also placed in a clear pattern, and that recutting was accompanied by the placing of deposits of pottery and/or bone along the ditch. He found that depositional patterns were present in the north and south corners of the ditch, and the entrance (Hill 1995, 79). As at Beechbrook, the emphasis on recutting was at the enclosure's entrance, and the ditch was much more slight at the rear (Hill 1995). Due to the acidic soil conditions at Beechbrook Wood the survival of animal bone was extremely poor and no comment can be made on the relationship between the deposition of pottery and animal bone.

The pottery recovered from the remodelling of the entranceway at Beechbrook Wood demonstrated many of the same fabrics and forms as the assemblage from the main body of the ditch (sub-group 2150). A charcoal dump in context 2346, intervention 2591 (the recut of 2212), produced a radiocarbon date of 390-170 cal BC (R-28562/5 NZA-20, 2207±40). The pottery from the earlier ditch fill (context 2213, intervention 2212) had been assigned a 4th to 2nd century BC date range based on morphological characteristics, with many forms typical of the 4th to 3rd centuries. The radiocarbon date therefore suggests that the recutting of the terminals was also carried out during this broad period. Furthermore, the radiocarbon date suggests that forms such as saucepan pots, previously little seen in the region, are broadly contemporary with their counterparts in areas such as Wessex, and are not a later phenomenon as had been suspected as sites such as Bigberry (Thompson 1983) and Farningham Hill (Couldrey 1984).

The largest deposit of pottery from the site came from context 2213, intervention 2212 through ditch 2150, and comprised 1094 sherds weighing 18369 g. This assemblage had a high mean sherd weight (16.8 g) and good surface preservation. At least thirty-three vessels had been deposited in this fill, and the profiles of eight were reconstructed and their capacities calculated (Table 13). The fabrics of the vessels consisted of both glauconitic and non-glauconitic sandy wares, grog-tempered, iron-gritted and quartz-gritted wares. Thin-sections have been made of a number of these fabrics, and will provide an opportunity to compare future samples from other sites in the area, such as Brisley Farm. Whilst none of the inclusions in the fabrics need to be seen as non-local, the occurrence of similar fabrics on nearby sites may be indicative of regional trading patterns, for either the pottery vessels or their contents.

PRN	Vessel no.	Catalogue	Form	Fabric	External	External	Capacity	Estimated
		no.			diameter	height	(litres)	% of vessel
					(cm)	(cm)		present
1007		10	D 10	62	•		10 50 6	00.00
1097	1	18	RI2	G3	28	27.7	12.786	80-90
1099/1100	2	19	RI3		26	-	-	15
1106	3	20	RI4	F14	37	-	-	10-15
1109	4	21	RI6	12	28	-	-	20-25
1114	5	22	RI6	Q5	22	-	-	20
1115	6	23	RI7	13	20	-	-	10
1116	7	24	R18	Q12	16	15	1.373	25
1117	8	25	R19	Q6	13	12.8	1.269	50
1118	9	26	R21	I4	16	18.5	2.849	40
1120	10	27	R16	F16	26	-	-	5-10
1121	11	28	R19	Q6	13	-	-	25
1122	12	29	R16	Q7	17	-	-	5
1123	13	30	R19	15	13	12.2	1.045	50
1124	14	31	R16	Q8	18	-	-	60-70
1126	15	32	R21	Q8	17	15.8	2.225	55
1127	16	33	R15	Q10	22	-	-	40
1128	17	34	R22	Q5	15	10.7	1.142	35
1129	18	35	R23	Q13	21	-	-	5-10
1131	19	36	R23	Q12	17	-	-	20
1132	20	37	R24	I4	9	-	-	20
1134	21	38	R19	G2	14	-	-	<5
1136	22	39	R27	G2	20	-	-	<5
1137	23	40	R19	Q5	13	-	-	<5
1138	24	41	R26	Q5	13	15.5	1.351	50-60
1140	25	42	R27	I1	16	-	-	<5
1141	26	43	R25	G2	21	-	-	<5
1142	27	44	R16	Q5	25	-	-	<5
1143	28	45	R29	Q8	-	-	-	<5
1144	29	46	R16	Q8	18	-	-	<5
1145	30	47	R16	Q8	18	-	-	<5
1146	31	48	R19	G1	16	-	-	<5
1152	32	49	R23	I1	-	-	-	<5
1153	33	50	R30	Q5	13	-	-	<5

Table 13: Vessels deposited in context 2212, ditch 2150

Seventeen forms were represented in context 2213, including nine S-profiled jars (R16 and R26), eight saucepan pots (R19 and R21), three high-shouldered ovoid vessels (R23), two bucket-shaped vessels (R15 and R18), three medium-necked jars (R25 and R27) and single examples of the large squat jar forms (R12 and R13), a convex-profile vessel (R17), the large jar with thickened rim (R14), an S-profiled bowl (R22), an everted-rim cup (R24), a barrel-shaped jar (R30) and a high-shouldered jar (R29). Four of the vessels appeared to form two pairs. Fig. 5, Nos 25 and 28 are both the earlier saucepan pot form (R19), and are almost identical in terms of fabric and size. During analysis the sherds initially appeared to represent a single vessel, but refitting of the sherds proved they did actually form separate vessels. Fig.

6 Nos 35 and 36 also initially appeared to represent a single pot, but closer inspections revealed variations in the fabric.

Fourteen of the vessels had evidence of having been used as cooking pots. Examples of forms R13, R19 (x2) and R26 had both external sooting and internal burnt residue: vessel. The largest reconstructable vessel, form R12 (Fig. 4, No. 18), was sooted on the exterior and abraded on the interior, the latter presumably caused by stirring or scraping of the contents. The capacity of this vessel has been calculated at 12.8 litres (Table 13). The similarity in vessel form and rim diameter between this vessel (28 cm diameter) and the form R13 vessel (Fig. 4, No. 19, 26 cm in diameter) suggests that the latter would also have been capable of holding a similar volume. Therefore, at least two of the vessels deposited in this context had been used to cook a large meal and indicate communal eating and possibly feasting.

A feast is described as 'an unusual meal to mark an unusual occasion' (Dietler and Hayden 2001, 3-4) and also as a meal that 'is not eaten solely for subsistence' (Clarke 2001, 145). At Beechbrook Wood, the deposition of thirty-three partial vessels into the tertiary fill of a ditch, in close proximity to the terminal, should be seen as deliberate and significant. None of the vessels was complete, the estimated proportions of the vessels placed in context 2213 are presented in Table 13. The possibility that the deposition of these vessels followed a feast, perhaps held to mark the closing of one phase of the enclosure, prior to the recutting of the terminal areas, is suggested by the large cooking pots placed in 2213, particularly the large R12 and R13 vessels. The ethnographic record holds numerous examples of the role feasts play in the maintenance of social alliances (cf Clarke 2001). Hayden (2001) has argued that feasts are a major component of 'social technology': 'the creation and maintenance of social relationships that are predicated on securing access to resources, labor, or security' (ibid., 26). Hingley has suggested that the 'feast should be envisaged as an act which reinforced the solidarity of the community formed out of the association of local social groups...' (Hingley 1990, 100).

A feast at Beechbrook Wood may have involved neighbouring social groups within the wider community, creating or re-inforcing relationships through the sharing of a meal, possibly in conjunction with the recutting of the enclosure entrance. The digging of enclosure ditches was a labour-intensive task, and the giving of feasts may have aided the procurement of labour during times of large-scale construction. In respect of Winnall Down, Hill (1995, 82) states 'Through participation of people from neighbouring settlements (and possibly further afield) relationships between groups....were (re-)affirmed. Simultaneously participation created/paid social obligations and relations necessary for the wider reproduction of society'.

13 CATALOGUE OF ILLUSTRATED SHERDS

(PRN, Pottery Record Number in database)

Figure 3

1. Bucket-shaped jar/urn; R3; fabric F3; PRN 1027, context 201, subsoil.

2. Body sherd with applied cordon and fingertip impressions; fabric F2; PRN 1005, context 205, pit 204.

3. Convex-profile neutral form; R1; fabric F3; wiped exterior; fingertip impressions on top of rim; PRN 1054, context 1048, pit 1049.

4. Convex-profile neutral form; R1; fabric GF1; burnished exterior; PRN 1006, context 244, waterhole 245.

5. Convex-profile vessel with incurving rim; R2; fabric F6; PRN 1019; context 244, waterhole 245.

6. Small, convex profile vessel; R2; fabric F4; PRN 1012, context 244, waterhole 245.

7. Straight-sided jar; R6; fabric F9; fingernail impressions on top of rim; PRN 1030, context 405, pit 404.

8. Upright cup/tub; R4; fabric F10; smoothed interior; burnt residue on interior; PRN 1034, context 446, pit 444.

9. Jar with collared neck; R5; fabric GF2; wiped both surfaces; fingertip impressions on top of rim; PRN 1044, context 580, pit 536.

10. Straight-sided jar; R6 and B3; fabric F8; finger-wiped exterior, wiped interior; traces of soot on exterior; PRN 1049, context 1200, pit 1220.

11. Flared rim with internal bevel; R7; fabric GF3; PRN 1068, context 1332, pit 1331.

12. Body sherd with fingertip impressions; wiped both surfaces; traces of external soot; fabric F10; PRN 1061, context 1197, ditch 1196, sub-group 1972.

13. Neutral/open form; R8; fabric QV1; PRN 1087, context 2018, ditch 2019.

14. Open vessel form, probable bowl; R9; fabric Q2; PRN 1088, context 2018, ditch 2019.

15. Convex-profile vessel with shaped neck; R10; fabric QV1; PRN 1089, context 2018, ditch 2019.

16. Jar with upright rim; R11; fabric QV1; burnished interior; PRN 1094, context 2018, ditch 2019.

Figure 4

17. High-shouldered jar; R29; fabric Q8; PRN 1522, context 2214, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

18. High-shouldered jar; R12; fabric G3; traces of external wiping, smoothed interior; sooted exterior; abraded lower interior; PRN 1097, vessel 1, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

19. Round-bodied jar; R13 and B1; fabric I1; wiped upper vessel interior and exterior; smoothed lower vessel exterior and interior; sooted upper vessel exterior, burnt residue on interior; PRN 1099 and 1100, vessel 2, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

20. Large jar with thickened rim; R14; fabric F14; wiped exterior, smoothed interior; sooted exterior; PRN 1106, vessel 3, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

Figure 5

21. S-profile jar; R16; fabric I2; burnished upper vessel interior and exterior, smoothed in other areas; traces of soot on upper vessel exterior; PRN 1109, vessel 4, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

22. S-profile jar; R16; fabric Q5; PRN 1114, vessel 5, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

23. Wide-mouthed, convex-profile jar; R17; fabric I3; PRN 1115, vessel 6, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

24. Bucket-shaped vessel; R18; fabric Q12; burnished exterior; PRN 1116, vessel 7, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

25. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric Q6; sooted exterior, burnt residue on interior; PRN 1117, vessel 8, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

26. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric I4; wiped exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1118 and 1119, vessel 9, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

27. S-profile jar; R16; fabric F16; wiped exterior, smoothed interior; sooted on upper vessel exterior; PRN 1120, vessel 10, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

28. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric Q6; sooted on upper vessel exterior, burnt residue on interior; PRN 1121, vessel 11, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

29. S-profile jar; R16; fabric Q7; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1122, vessel 12, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

30. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric I5; traces of burnish on upper vessel exterior, traces of wiping on lower vessel interior; PRN 1123, vessel 13, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

Figure 6

31. S-profile jar; R16; fabric Q8; burnished both surfaces; patches of burnt residue on vessel interior; PRN 1124, vessel 14, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

32. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric Q8; burnished exterior; PRN 1126, vessel 15, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

33. Flower-pot style vessel; R15; fabric Q10; finger-wiping on exterior; burnt residue on interior; PRN 1127, vessel 16, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

34. S-profile bowl; R22, B4; fabric Q5; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1128, vessel 17, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

35. High-shouldered bowl; R23; fabric Q13; burnished upper vessel exterior, roughened lower vessel exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1129, vessel 18, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

36. High-shouldered bowl; R23; fabric Q12; burnished upper vessel interior and exterior, roughened lower vessel exterior, smoothed interior; burnt residue on interior; PRN 1131, vessel 19, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

37. Everted rim cup: R24; fabric I4; smoothed exterior, burnished interior; PRN 1132, vessel 20, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

38. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric G2; patches of burnt residue on vessel interior; PRN 1134, vessel 21, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

39. Medium-necked jar; R27; fabric G2; smoothed both surfaces, finger-wiping on exterior; PRN 1136, vessel 22, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

40. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric Q5; smoothed exterior, burnished interior; PRN 1137, vessel 23, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

Figure 7

41. S-profile jar; R26; fabric Q5; burnished upper vessel exterior and interior, and top of rim, roughened lower exterior, all other areas have been smoothed; sooting on exterior, burnt residue on interior; PRN 1138, vessel 24, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

42. Medium-necked jar; R27; fabric I1; smoothed both surfaces; sooted exterior, burnt residue on interior; PRN 1140, vessel 25, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

43. Medium-necked jar; R25; fabric G2; sooted exterior; PRN 1141, vessel 26, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

44. Probable S-profile jar rim; R16; fabric Q5; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1142, vessel 27, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

45. High-shouldered jar; R29; fabric Q8; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1143, vessel 28, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

46. Probable S-profile jar rim; R16; fabric Q8; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1144, vessel 29, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

47. Probable S-profile jar rim; R16; fabric Q8; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1145, vessel 30, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

48. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric G1; burnished exterior; tooled parallel lines on exterior; PRN 1146, vessel 31, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

49. High-shouldered vessel; R23; fabric I1; burnished upper vessel exterior, roughened lower vessel exterior; PRN 1152, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

50. Barrel-shaped jar; R30; fabric Q5; smoothed exterior, burnished interior; PRN 1153, vessel 33, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

51. Base with protruding foot; B6; fabric Q5; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1163, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

52. Plain base; B1; fabric G1; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1164, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

53. Sherd with tooled, curvilinear decoration; burnished both surfaces; fabric Q5; PRN 1155, context 2213, intervention 2212, ditch 2150.

54. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric Q5; burnished upper vessel exterior and top of rim; PRN 1436, context 2357, intervention 2355, ditch 2150.

55. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric G1; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1428, context 2357, intervention 2355, ditch 2150.

56. Low pedestal base; B5; fabric I3; burnished exterior; PRN 1429, context 2357, intervention 2355, ditch 2150.

57. S-profile bowl; R22; fabric Q8; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1255, context 2265, intervention 2259, ditch 2150.

58. Decorated body sherd; fabric F16; smoothed interior; combed exterior; PRN 1450, context 2297, intervention 2300, ditch 2150.

59. Decorated body sherd; fabric G6; incised lines on exterior; PRN 1452, context 2297, intervention 2300, ditch 2150.

60. S-profile jar; R16; fabric F14; burnished exterior; PRN 1541, context 2293, intervention 2295, ditch 2150.

61. Slightly out-turned rim; R25; fabric Q8; smoothed both surfaces; PRN 1546, context 2294, intervention 2295, ditch 2150.

62. Probable S-profile jar rim; R16; fabric Q17; burnished exterior and upper vessel interior; PRN 1475, context 2287, intervention 2288, ditch 2150.

63. S-profile bowl; R22; fabric Q8; smoothed both surfaces; PRN 1498, context 2255, intervention 2254, ditch 2150.

Figure 8

64. Barrel-shaped jar; R30; fabric Q5; smoothed upper vessel exterior and lower vessel interior, roughened lower vessel exterior; burnt residue on interior; PRN 1562, context 2147, finds from machining in the area of ditch 2150.

65. Decorated body sherd; fabric F16; combed exterior; PRN 1561, context 2147, finds from machining in the area of ditch 2150.

66. Internally-bevelled rim; R34; fabric G1; PRN 1328, context 2147, finds from machining in the area of ditch 2150.

67. Body sherd; fabric Q5; smoothed both surfaces; post-firing perforated hole through sherd; sooted exterior; PRN 1309, context 2147, finds from machining in the area of ditch 2150.
68. High-shouldered vessel; R23; fabric I1; smoothed both surfaces; PRN 1437, context 2345, intervention 2591, ditch 7001.

69. Bucket-shaped vessel; R18; fabric Q5; burnished exterior; PRN 1508, context 2210, intervention 2591, ditch 7001.

70. Sherd with combed decoration; fabric Q5; PRN 1509, context 2210, intervention 2591, ditch 7001.

71. Shallow bowl; R28; fabric G4; burnished exterior, smoothed interior; PRN 1366, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

72. S-profile jar; R16; fabric I3; burnished exterior and upper vessel interior, smoothed in other areas; PRN 1368, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

73. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric I5; smoothed both surfaces; PRN 1369, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

74. Slightly out-turned rim; R27; fabric Q8; scored lines on rim exterior; PRN 1382, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

75. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric G1; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1384, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

76. Barrel-shaped jar; R30; fabric I4; burnished exterior; smoothed interior; burnt residue on interior; PRN 1388, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

77. Low pedestal base; B5; fabric Q8; smoothed exterior; PRN 1390, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

78. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric Q5; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1400, context 2358, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

79. Combed body sherds; fabric Q5; smoothed both surfaces; PRN 1403, context 2360, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

80. Barrel-shaped jar; R36; fabric I1, burnished both surfaces; PRN 1413, context 2360, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

81. Hemispherical bowl; R33; fabric I5; PRN 1414, context 2360, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

82. Hemispherical bowl; R33; fabric Q7; PRN 1415, context 2360, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

83. Saucepan pot; R21; fabric Q5; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1417, context 2360, intervention 7030, ditch 7001.

84. Barrel-shaped jar; R30; fabric Q8; burnished exterior and upper interior; pitted interior; PRN 1267, context 2269, intervention 2268, ditch 7001.

85. S-profile jar; R16; fabric I4; wiped exterior and top of rim, smoothed interior; sooted exterior; PRN 1268, context 2269, intervention 2268, ditch 7001.

86. Hemispherical bowl; R33; fabric Q7; PRN 1271, context 2269, intervention 2268, ditch 7001.

87. Round-bellied bowl; R32; fabric Q8; PRN 1272, context 2269, intervention 2268, ditch 7001.

88. Footring base; B4 (possibly from an S-profile jar, R26); fabric Q15; band of impressed decoration around vessel neck; PRN 1273, context 2271, intervention 2268, ditch 7001.

89. Low pedestal base from round-bodied vessel form; B5; fabric Q8; burnished both surfaces; PRN 1476, context 2241, intervention 7010, ditch 7001.

90. Hemispherical bowl; R33; fabric F14; smoothed interior; PRN 1478, context 2241, intervention 7010, ditch 7001.

Figure 9

91. Saucepan pot; R19; fabric Q5; PRN 1484, context 2241, intervention 7010, ditch 7001.
92. Large jar with rolled rim; R35; fabric F14; PRN 1526, context 2222, intervention 2206, ditch 7001.

93. Concave rim from unknown vessel form; R99; fabric I4; PRN 1602, context 2237, intervention 2236, ditch 2151.

94. Jar with thickened rim; R14; fabric F14; PRN 1638, context 2370, intervention 2372, ditch 2432.

95. Rim from unknown vessel form: R99; fabric I1; smoothed exterior; PRN 1605, context 2247, intervention 2249, ditch 2434.

96. Plain, flat base; B1; fabric Q5; burnished interior; tooled, irregular lines on exterior; PRN 1633, context 2365, pit 2366, interior of ditch 2150.

97. Decorated body sherd; fabric Q5; smoothed interior; combed exterior; PRN 1589, context 1533, posthole 1532.

98. Decorated body sherd; fabric F14; incised lines on exterior; PRN 1589, context 1533, posthole 1532.

99. Decorated body sherd; fabric F14; combed exterior; PRN 1569, context 858, intervention 857, ditch 1027.

14 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, L, and Needham, S, 1985 New Research on a late Bronze Age enclosure at Queen Mary's Hospital, Carshalton, *Surrey Archaeol Collections* **76**, 12-50

Barclay, A, 1994 Prehistoric pottery, in Mudd, A, Excavation of a later Bronze Age site at Coldharbour Road, Gravesend, *Archaeol Cantiana* **114**, 363-410

Barrett, J C, 1980 The pottery of the later Bronze Age in lowland England, *Proc Prehist Soc* **46**, 297-319

Bradley, R, 1985 Prehistoric pottery, in Excavations at Pingewood (ed M Bowden), *Berks Archaeol J* 72

Brown, L, 2000 The regional ceramic sequence, in Cunliffe, B, *The Danebury Environs Programme; The Prehistory of a Wessex Landscape Volume 1 Introduction*, Oxford, 79-127

Brown, N, 1988 A late Bronze Age Enclosure at Lofts Farm, Essex, *Proc Prehistoric Soc* 54, 249-302

Brown, N 1995a Prehistoric pottery, in Atkinson, M, A late Bronze Age enclosure at Broomfield, Chelmsford, *Essex Archaeol and Hist* **26**, 8-14

Brown, N, 1995b Prehistoric pottery, in Ecclestone, J, Early Iron Age settlement at Southend: excavations at Fox Hall Farm, 1993, *Essex Archaeol and Hist* **26**, 28-35

Champion, T, forthcoming Settlement in Kent 1500 to 300 BC, in Haselgrove, C, and Pope, R, *Proceedings of early Iron Age conference, Durham 2002*, Oxford**

Clark, A J, and Thompson, F H, 1989 Revised radiocarbon dates for three hillforts in Kent and Surrey, *Antiqs J* 69, 303-307

Clarke, M J, 2001 Akha feasting: An ethnoarchaeological perspective, in *Feasts. Archaeological and ethnographic perspectives on food, politics, and power* (eds M Dietler and B Hayden), Washington and London, 144-167

Couldrey, P, 1984 The Iron Age Pottery, in Philp, B, The Iron Age farmstead on Farningham Hill, in Philp, B, *Excavations in the Darent Valley, Kent*, Kent Monog Ser Res Rep 4, Kent Archaeol Rescue Unit, Dover, 38-70

Cunliffe, B, 1980 Overall discussion of the Iron Age pottery, in Macpherson-Grant, N, haeological work along the A2: 1966-1974, *Archaeol Cantiana* **96**, 174-179

Cunliffe, B, 1991 Iron Age communities in Britain, London (3rd ed)

Dietler, M, and Hayden, B, 2001 Digesting the feast – good to eat, good to drink, good to think: an introduction, in *Feasts. Archaeological and ethnographic perspectives on food, politics and power* (eds M Dietler and B Hayden), Washington and London, 1-20

Drury, P J, 1978 *Excavations at Little Waltham 1970-71*, CBA Res Rep **26**, Chelmsford Excav Comm Rep **1**

Ellison, A 1981 The middle Bronze Age pottery (Deverel-Rimbury and Post-Deverel-Rimbury), in Dacre, M, and Ellison, A, A Bronze Age urn cemetery at Kimpton, Hampshire, *Proc Prehist Soc* **47** 147-203

Elsdon, S M, 1992 East Midlands scored ware, *Trans Leicestershire Archaeol and Hist Soc* 66, 83-91

Hall, M, 1992 The prehistoric pottery, in Moore, J, and Jennings, D, *Reading Business Park: a Bronze Age landscape*, Oxford Archaeol Unit Thames Valley Landscapes: the Kennet Valley volume **1**, Oxford, 63-82

Hally, D J, 1983 Use alteration of pottery vessel surfaces, *North American Archaeologist*, **4** (I), 3-26

Hamilton, S, 2002 The Mile Oak pottery assemblage – its stratigraphic context, forms, fabrics, chronology and regional significance, in M Russell, Excavations at Mile Oak Farm, in *Downland Settlement and Land-Use; the Archaeology of the Brighton Bypass* (ed D Rudling), London, 36-53

Hamilton, S, 2002 The Downsview pottery with specific reference to the Bronze Age assemblage: its forms, dating and regional implications, in Rudling, D, Excavations adjacent to Coldean Lane, in *Downland Settlement and Land-Use; the Archaeology of the Brighton Bypass* (ed D Rudling), London, 170-182

Hayden, B, 2001 Fabulous Feasts: A prolegomenon to the importance of feasting, in *Feasts*. *Archaeological and ethnographic perspectives on food, politics, and power* (eds M Dietler and B Hayden), Washington and London, 23-64

Hill, J D, 1995 Ritual and rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex, BAR British Series 242, Oxford

Hingley, R, 1990 Boundaries surrounding Iron Age and Romano-British settlements, *Scottish Archaeol Review* 7, 96-103

Longley, D, 1980 Runnymede Bridge 1976: Excavations on the site of a late Bronze Age settlement, *Research Volume of the Surrey Archaeological Society*, **6**, Guildford

Macpherson-Grant, N, 1980 Archaeological work along the A2: 1966-1974, Archaeol Cantiana 96, 133-183

Macpherson-Grant, N, 1991 A re-appraisal of prehistoric pottery from Canterbury, *Canterbury's Archaeology 15th annual report 1990-1991*, Canterbury, 38-48

Macpherson-Grant, N, 1992 The pottery, in Perkins, D R J, Archaeological evaluations at Ebbsfleet in the Isle of Thanet, *Archaeol Cantiana* **110**, 286-303

Needham, S, 1996 Chronology and periodisation in the British Bronze Age, Acta Archaeologica 67, 121-140

PCRG, 1997 The study of later prehistoric pottery: general policies and guidelines for analysis and publication, reprint, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Occasional Papers 1 and 2, Oxford

Rice, P M, 1987 Pottery analysis: A sourcebook, Chicago

Skibo, J M, 1992 Pottery function: a use-alteration perspective, New York

Thompson, F H, 1983 Excavations at Bigberry, near Canterbury, 1978-80, Antiqs J 63, 237-278

Thompson, F H, 1986 The Iron Age hillfort of Oldbury, Kent: excavations 1983-4, Antiqs J 66, 267-286

Trow, S, and Cameron, F, 1998 The pottery, in Kinnes, I, Cameron, F, Trow, S, and Thomson, D, *Excavations at Cliffe, Kent*, Brit Mus Occ Paper No **69**, London, 29-51

Wilson, D, 1993 Iron Age pottery, in Allen, T G, and Robinson, M A, *The prehistoric landscape and Iron Age enclosed settlement at Mingies Ditch, Hardwick-with-Yelford, Oxon*, Oxford Archaeological Unit Thames Valley Landscapes: The Windrush Valley Vol **2**, 70-75